

**Minutes
May 14-15, 2002
Hixon Union Building - Whitworth College
Spokane, Washington**

May 14, 2002

Members Present:	Tom Charouhas, Chair Rebecca Bowers Carol Coar Sheila Fox Kathryn Nelson Martha Rice Karen Simpson Yvonne Ullas	Elaine Aoki Carolyn Bradley Ken Evans Gary Livingston Helen Nelson-Throssell Ron Scutt Dennis Sterner
Members Absent:	Nancy Diaz-Miller Terry Bergeson	Tim Knue
Staff Present:	Jennifer Wallace David Anderson	Pamela Abbott

Chair Charouhas called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

AGENDA

The board reviewed and approved the agenda for both days.

MINUTES

MOTION: The May minutes were approved unanimously.

UPDATE ON WEST-B

David Anderson provided a PowerPoint presentation on the basic skills assessment system for prospective teachers. This presentation was prepared by Jennifer Wallace for the Washington Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (WACTE) and may be downloaded at www.pesb.wa.gov/meetings/may2002/presentations.htm

The fairness committee has concerns regarding the content of the WEST-B.

- They felt some of the writing items represented a large amount of reading.
- They felt the items were not balanced enough towards items of concern for our region.
- They felt items might bring up sensitive personal issues for test takers.

Dr. Anderson and project staff at NES had a conference call with Nikki Elliot Schuman, OSPI, who is working on the WASL. Dr. Anderson asked her to review WEST-B sample items and test objectives and give recommendations on how to link the WEST-B with the student assessment language.

Ms. Schuman felt

- It is appropriate to measure some of the writing skills with multiple-choice questions.
- The writing samples should be more elaborate.

The PESB staff and NES staff will have a study guide including how to prepare for the test available for test takers. In July, the Technical Advisory Group will meet to discuss how to set the cut score.

WEST-B EXEMPTION POLICY

Dr. Anderson reviewed the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee regarding the WEST-B exemption policy.

The Executive Committee met with Legislators on April 4, 2002 and received feedback regarding the intent of the section of HB 2760 which allows the PESB to set exemptions. The legislators were interested in the PESB collecting data and making sure any exemptions would be legally defensible. The legislators are willing to risk quantity for quality.

The Technical Advisory Committee recognizes a need to establish a process to collect data and then make a sound decision.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gary King, WEA, spoke to the Board. Mr. King reminded the Board that this test is about politics as well as standards for the teaching profession. WEA has opposed a test for current teachers and has agreed to support the basic skills test as an admissions tool. Mr. King applauds the PESB for developing a test that will be excellent and for the PESB not accepting a broad exemption policy.

EMERGENCY RULE ADOPTION

The basic skills exemption policy will reside in WAC 181. Ms. Wallace shared the language staff has developed overtime with the certification staff at OSPI. The language reads:

Individuals applying for a Washington State Teaching Certificate who have completed an approved teacher preparation program in another state or country have up to one calendar year from issuance of temporary certificate to pass the WEST-B basic skills test, provided that they have completed all other requirements for residency certification other than passage of the WEST-B and are thus eligible for a temporary permit under WAC 180-79A-128.

MOTION: Moved by Sheila Fox, seconded by Martha Rice to adopt the exemption policy as presented. **The motion passed unanimously.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Service Credit

Ms. Wallace reviewed the memo to the members regarding service credit for teachers in residence. Since this is really a public v. private school issue, it will have to be brought to the attention of the Joint Committee on Pension Policy (JCPP). In RCW 41.50, there are provisions that allow investment by the institution.

ESA Credit toward retirement

There appears to be inequity between teachers and ESAs in terms of less than full-time employment credit unless you are a counselor or librarian. In current law, public school districts or community college employees in an instructional position employed less than full time may elect to have earnable compensation defined as the compensation the member would have received in the same position if employed on a regular full-time basis for the same contract period. RCW defines the instructional position as one in which more than 75% of person's time is spent as a classroom instructor, counselor, or librarian.

This is also an issue about which the Legislature would look to the JCPP for guidance. However, it does look possible that this may be an instance where RCW reflects oversight or lack of understanding in terms of who actually serves in an instructional role. An ESA may qualify if they meet the intent or even question the intent itself. This is something that WEA plans to raise with policy makers about changing. The PESB may want to say something about this issue.

Fall policy forum

Ms. Wallace discussed the possibility of a fall policy forum with legislators and educators. Board members:

- called for a regional and statewide focus to address perception.
- expressed concern over setting an agenda and feel that having a facilitator that is neutral and uses a balanced approach to address issues is important.
- would like to see the meeting participants follow-up on the issues brought about at the meeting.

One possible focus area could be: What can we do together to enhance teacher preparation in Washington?

Ms. Wallace will continue to work on an agenda for the fall policy forum.

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE

Carolyn Bradley provided an update on the professional certificate.

The WACPTS committee was enacted to create the standards for the professional level certificate. The PESB hasn't taken any action about the professional certificate.

WACTE and OSPI are still working on the professional certificate. The institutes of higher education are working on creating programs to allow teachers to attain their professional certificate through their institutions, however they are afraid that the professional certificate may go away after they have invested huge amounts of time and resources.

Ms. Bradley reviewed the timeline a teacher who receives residency certification must follow in order to reach their professional level certificate.

- The professional certificate is intended to be an individualized program. The professional certificate is valid for 5 years and can be renewed for 5 additional years.
- Many people who are going through this process have stated emphatically how this is the best thing they have done for themselves and that it may be equated with the National Board certification.
- At a recent WEA meeting, teachers were invited to talk about issues they are having. The professional certificate is a huge concern and there was an incredible amount of misinformation.
- The information is available, but it is not getting to people in an efficient manor.
- Many are concerned that it is an unfounded mandate.

During the lunch hour, the PESB watched an excerpt from the March State Board of Education meeting about the fears and concerns many are people are experiencing with regards to the professional certificate.

Dr. Lin Douglas, OSPI, discussed the professional certificate. Washington is out in front on this issue and is in front because many really wanted to reculture professional development for teachers. The greatest selling point for districts is that they can accessorize the "basic car." It is important as we talk to districts about the preservice teacher that they understand they are getting the "basic car" and with the professional certificate, they can accessorize.

When Dr. Douglas started working with the representatives from the colleges and universities, all agreed it would be a scary process, but knew it would be worth the trip. The colleges are currently working on how to make the programs more alike than different.

The programs that became approved under the 1997 standards are required to inform students enrolled in their teacher certification programs about professional certification by 2000. While out on the site visits, it is apparent from interviews with students that institutions are not informing their students of this requirement.

There is an option for people to renew for 5 years that are not currently teaching. During the pilots, we found this to be a very effective process.

It is important to understand that the people who felt stressed under this program felt this way because the program was collapsed into at master's level with a 1-2 year turnaround.

OSPI has received feedback about the professional certificate suggesting people would like the latitude about when a candidate enters the program.

Based on the March 15, 2002 State Board of Education meeting, OSPI is now allowing up to 20 clock hours towards professional certificate to people who have participated in a professional growth team.

MOTION: Moved by Carolyn Bradley, seconded by Gary Livingston. The Professional Educator Standards Board has the intent that it will monitor the implementation of the professional certificate and will do so through the development of a study group. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Charouhas asked Carolyn Bradley to convene a study group to develop some preliminary questions.

CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION ON THE PESB

In response to legislative requests, the PESB convened a discussion about adding a classified employee representative to the PESB.

Public School Employees of Washington, PSE

Doug Nelson, (PSE) presented in favor of adding a classified employee representative to the PESB membership. A copy of Mr. Nelson's testimony is available upon request.

Mr. Nelson feels paraeducators play a critical role in helping students succeed in school. He feels they deserve a seat at the table. Mr. Nelson's answers to several questions from the PESB members are contained on the following pages.

1. Is your view to have the paraeducator on our board to expand our agenda or to include their view?

I don't know that further issues will arise. The issues that you are working on specifically as they relate to teacher quality and trying to encourage people to become teachers relate to paraeducators, and they have a very strong opinion on what is a good teacher. Mr. Nelson is not suggesting that their opinion is any better, but there are 22,000 paraeducators working with teachers and he feels it enhances the credibility of the board for the paraeducators to have their opinions heard at least on the decisions the board does make.

2. We've had other groups come to us also wishing they were also seated at the table. We have invited them to come to the meetings and participate as many people do. We haven't consistently seen somebody from PSE at our meetings. Why is it now you feel you need to have membership in the group and why that is more important than just providing public comment?

Mr. Nelson feels there is a dramatic difference between paraeducators sitting in the audience and sitting at the table. He doesn't know if any of the board members have sat in from a classified point of view to hear legislators or leadership talk about the success of education. They talk about the importance of the teachers, administrators, students and parents working together. If you were a classified employee working towards success, how would that make you feel? Sitting in the audience is not appropriate to the role that they play. They do need to be sitting at the table.

3. When you were going through the process. How many legislators were supporting your proposal at that point?

The initial reaction from legislators was excitement. Amendments were drawn, however, the board hadn't had a chance to review them. It is very important in the legislative process to respond to the situation before you act. Therefore, the leadership decided it was not an issue that had to be decided.

Jennifer Wallace reminded Mr. Nelson and the board that the issue of adding a classified employee to the membership of the board hadn't been brought to the attention of the full board to discuss prior to the introduction of the proposed amendment to legislation.

4. Twenty-two other standards boards do not have classified employees represented. What is the difference?

Mr. Nelson stated that the reason why other states do not have classified employees represented on their professional educator standards boards is because other states don't have him working for their classified staff. When paraeducators look at boards that are doing important work in education and they say to themselves, "Are we doing important work

here?” and by not having a voice on the board, they are given the message that they don’t belong.

5. Would you see this person as a non-voting member?

This is back to sitting in the audience v. sitting at the table. There is a big difference in sitting at the table, being respected and getting to say yes or no. It is so important to them because so few people acknowledge their role.

Martha Rice expressed her view that if we have a parent and community member on this board, paraeducators have an equal stake. She understands their perspective. However, she is not willing to give up a parent and community position to bring a paraeducator to the board and have a voice. Ms. Rice believes we need to have the non-educator voices on the board. Non-educators have a strong stake in the educational product that comes out of the school.

6. The work of the board is to make some policy and make recommendations to the State Board of Education. If we were to make recommendations to for policy changes for paraeducators would they be able to be implemented? Isn’t there a structure for classified staff that makes its own rules? Wouldn’t we have a clash of authority if we made recommendations?

Mr. Nelson stated that there is nothing.

Jennifer Wallace explained that OSPI has some authority in terms of competencies. Some RCW and WAC exist in terms of hiring and placement. In order for us to gain authority, it would require assigning us a whole new realm of work. There is a difference between adding paraeducator on the board and focusing on paraeducator issues.

In the reauthorization of ESEA, paraeducators will have to have an AA degree, two years of college or passing a basic skills test. Paraeducators would not be able to take the teacher basic skills test because it wouldn’t be an appropriate test. If the PESB were handed the responsibility for developing a single test, think of how much time would be taken up on the agenda.

7. Dr. Rebecca Bowers explained that in other professions, especially the medical profession, doctors and nurses have their own professional associations and governing bodies. There seems to be delineation much like teachers, principals, counselors and paraprofessionals. They all work together toward the same product, but they have different guidelines that they have to follow in their jobs. It is a major concern that many paraprofessionals in education are doing the same job as teachers.

Dr. Bowers questioned whether it is in their job description to be doing the same job as teachers or has someone breeched the job description. They may in fact be doing a good job, but are there risks involved? It seems to that a separate paraprofessional organization should be created that works in concert with professional teacher, principal, and counselor organizations.

Mr. Nelson could not say whether the legislature will develop a separate board. He felt as though Dr. Bowers was heading into the exclusive realm of “if this is a teacher board it should be just teachers”. He explained that the board isn’t just teachers. It does include a lot of other teacher groups because they may have some input that may be useful in establishing the standards of an effective educator.

Mr. Nelson believes the Senators and Representatives feel it enhances the board’s decision making.

Dr. Bowers clarified that she did not mean to imply that this is a teacher only board and that it should be a teacher only board. If we add a paraeducator, we are heading down a slippery slope. College and university students enrolled in teacher preparation programs will want to be members of the board, and other groups will want to be members of the board. Obviously their input is valuable, but there is a point at which certain types of boards need to stay where they are in order to address critical issues and can do so in a reasonable way with the time restrictions placed upon them.

Mr. Nelson agrees that there is an issue of other groups coming forward and saying, “Where is my position?” They would have to go to the Legislature and make their case. If there have been groups that have come forward, did any of the groups get such strong legislative support and come to you with a letter suggesting that you take a serious look at it?

Washington Education Association (WEA)

Gary King from WEA shared that he has discussed this issue with a couple of WEA’s paraeducators as well as Charles Hasse the WEA President. The paraeducators and Mr. Hasse share Mr. King’s view, however it is not an official position of the WEA.

Mr. King feels that the PESB should not have a paraeducator added to the PESB. Mr. King believes the questions and comments asked of Doug Nelson clarify his remarks.

Mr. King feels the purpose of the PESB is clear. The PESB’s existence is by virtue of the Governor, Superintendent Bergeson and education organizations such as the WEA promoting legislation to establish a professional educator standards board modeled on legislation from other states based on a belief that the most important factor in a

student's success is the quality of the teacher in the student's classroom. This has been reinforced by recent studies. The state of Washington wants to try to ensure more than anything else that the quality of the teacher in the classroom is of high caliber and highest standards and that is why the membership of the PESB represents every aspect of the professionally certificated employee group in Washington State public schools -- whether it be the higher education institution of training, whether it be a classroom teacher, principal or supervisory role that is why you are here.

There are other representatives on this board for purely political reasons. Mr. King feels Martha Rice put it very well when she stated a representative from the consumer group is of value. The addition of a parent and a public representative was accepted as an amendment to this legislation and is certainly a value. The focus must remain and the public and parent help keep that focus on the quality of the professional educator as it relates to student performance.

Mr. King also feels Dr. Bowers' remarks in describing her view and creating a metaphor of the medical profession and how it relates to the education profession really describes it better than he could.

Mr. King would like to honor that there is tremendous value and importance in classified employees, specifically in our paraeducators in our educational endeavors. Mr. King believes paraeducators are very important to our membership of WEA and they are certainly important to our schools.

Mr. King believes that Mr. Nelson is right when he says paraeducators are closely connected with instructional classrooms. WEA also represents other paraeducators. Mr. King works with school secretaries who feel they are intimately connected with the instructional program as well as the whole child. They are often the first contact with the child. He has also worked with bus drivers who have an instructional method on their busses.

Mr. King spoke with Superintendent Terry Bergeson and explained to her that as Superintendent she must immediately establish a workgroup, taskforce, or committee to address the needs of the paraeducator regarding ESEA. Dr. Bergeson agreed to establish this committee. Dr. Bergeson understands that they need to immediately pull paraeducators together to deal with the question of what ESEA is putting upon our educators.

The paraeducators have competencies that have been well established that are there are standards that need to be more fully implemented. More focus needs to be placed on implementing these standards and the PESB is not a board capable of doing it and he doesn't believe the PESB should be adding it to their workload.

Mr. King believes the work of the standards board should be focused on the teacher quality questions below:

- How many teachers in our state are "highly qualified" as now defined by ESEA?

- How many teachers in our state are teaching under emergency certificates or other waivers?
- Does our state have a system to track this data accurately?
- How will Washington State ensure that beginning this fall, all Title 1 teachers have met the new requirements for “highly qualified”?
- How will our state ensure that by 2006 that all teachers meet the definition of “highly qualified”?
- In what ways are our teacher licensure process and policies going to need to change to meet the ESEA?
- How will our state strike a balance between assuring all teachers are “highly qualified” and the need to cope with teacher shortages and the need to cope with competition from other states like California?
- How is our state going to ensure that teachers entering the classroom through alternative routes meet the new requirements as stated under the ESEA?
- How will our state discourage out of field teaching?

Mr. King believes the issues above are really compelling issues and that they represent a full plate. Mr. King applauds the efforts and the volunteer work the PESB takes on and encouraged the PESB not to add to their burden.

Ms. Wallace reminded the board members that the common thread among each member is the language says, “certified”. It was not meant to be exclusive.

1. If a paraeducator was added to the board, who would be chosen to represent this group? Would we need 5 additional members to represent each union?

Mr. King believes the Governor would select the paraeducator representative and the paraeducator would be expected to represent the collective views of paraeducators.

2. If we had an additional member we would risk being forced to a larger plate.

You are inclusive, however it won’t stop there. You will become a dumping ground for the education committee.

Washington Federation of Teachers (WFT)

Mr. Scott from WFT thanked the board for inviting him to attend the meeting. The WFT represents 7500 members statewide.

Mr. Scott’s main concern is how this board and what it does relates to the ESEA reauthorization. Mr. Scott agrees with both Mr. King and Mr. Nelson about the contributions and qualifications paraeducators make to the educational system.

There is a definite dignity issue in the classroom. Many times paraeducators feel like a second-class citizen. Mr. Scott thinks paraeducators need a voice at the table, he's just not sure it is this table. Mr. Scott is heartened to hear that Superintendent Bergeson is committed to look at the ESEA issues. He is not sure whether the PESB should undertake the task.

The PESB was formed to be a certification board for teachers and principals and Mr. Scott is not sure how paraeducators fit into the group. If paraeducators are going to participate in a group, he would like to see them get the most "bang for their buck," and he is not sure it will happen in this forum. Mr. Scott believes the PESB does a fine job, but shares Mr. King's concern that by broadening the franchise so much that you dissipate the impact you have and that would defeat the whole purpose.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that Ms. Wallace would prepare a draft memo to the Legislators responding to their request with a pro/con discussion leading to the conclusion that the cons outweigh the pros. Ms. Wallace will prepare a draft memo, share it with the members and deliver it to the Legislators by the end of June.

May 15, 2002

Members Present:	Tom Charouhas, Chair Rebecca Bowers Carol Coar Sheila Fox Kathryn Nelson Martha Rice Karen Simpson Yvonne Ullas	Elaine Aoki Carolyn Bradley Ken Evans Gary Livingston Helen Nelson-Throssell Ron Scutt Dennis Sterner
Members Absent:	Nancy Diaz-Miller Terry Bergeson	Tim Knue
Staff Present:	Jennifer Wallace David Anderson	Pamela Abbott

Chair Charouhas called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and reviewed the previous day's work and the agenda for the day.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE STUDY GROUP

Carolyn Bradley, Ken Evans, Carol Coar, Rebecca Bowers, Yvonne Ullas and Kay Nelson will participate in the Professional Certificate Study Group.

PROPOSAL REVIEW AND VENDOR SELECTION – OVERVIEW

Dr. Anderson reviewed the process the board has implemented to make a selection of the subject knowledge test. The board approved the request for proposals at the January meeting; received two proposals in March, and heard presentations from the vendors. A technical review panel has met and reviewed the proposals.

Dr. McQuarry discussed the specifications of the RFP as well as the key aspects of each proposal. The board discussed each proposal and presented many questions to Dr. McQuarry.

Dr. McQuarry urged the board to consider and reflect on the staff resources (board staff) and capabilities to manage and monitor a large test development. Would require a different type of management. The RFP contained some safeguards. Regardless of whatever vendor the board chooses, a strong advisory group is needed to oversee the progress. In any in-depth project, it is better to have enough staff. With current staff, it is doable, but not optimal.

If NES is chosen, large content committees will be asked to participate in the development.

- The conversation you will want to have is to think carefully about what extent do you want you and your staff to be involved in a high level of involvement.
- Limited number of practitioners.
- Will there be enough time?
- Technical issue – Washington is a relatively small state. It may be difficult to get enough people to do a review of all 33 areas.

Technical Advisory Committee

Dr. McQuarry believes ETS is right not to need technical advice. They have their own cadre of advisors. Dr. McQuarry doesn't see ETS as being out of compliance.

With NES, the customization would require a technical advisory committee. If the board chooses a development option, they will need technical advisors to give advice about what to do. Dr. McQuarry would suggest in negotiations, the board might ask for a smaller oversight committee.

Specifications in the RFP

- The RFP that was issued offered the choice of all custom, all off the shelf, or some hybrid. Dr. McQuarry stressed the choice should be between the two vendors.
- Panel found that both vendors had the capacity to deliver subject knowledge tests. They did not reach a consensus on a preferred vendor. Dr. McQuarry favored ETS slightly and Dr. Ensign favored NES.
- Choice between two very different approaches.
- Either one of these contractors can deliver on what they propose to do.
- Both companies have been in the business a long time and would help with any legal battle.

Key aspects of each proposal:

NES

- Has offered to implement tests to meet the timeline and then to customize up to 10 tests or customize all tests. NES is willing to offer up to 40 customized tests.
- Responsiveness, flexibility and responsibility to educators and cost.
- If selected, the board would be provided with up to 10 custom tests. Optimal integration and coordination with the WEST-B, extensive involvement of Washington people, flexibility in reporting, and no charge to the candidates for reports.
- NES proposed a hybrid.
- The proposal is similar to ETS in that they are proposing to use off the shelf and phasing in tests.
- NES is offering voluntary tests that would not be used in 2004 and 2005. The intent would be that programs would be able to see the test for a couple of years before it was required. In 10 areas they wouldn't have a full 2 years and in 5 there wouldn't be any time.
- You asked for 33, proposed that you pick the 10 that you would like to customize. Looking for ways to meet your needs within the limits that are professionally responsible for the development of the test.
- Allows a lot of flexibility and involves Washington educators to have buy-in.
- Cost for the test can be set as a custom fee.
- Works largely with highly populated states.

ETS

- Reputation, institutional resources, availability of data.
- ETS offers the board a program with existing tests, broadly recognized tests and a national score average.
- ETS proposed all off the shelf.
- The ETS proposal wasn't that big because they are proposing off the shelf; therefore you don't need any development.
- Virtually turnkey, implemented fully and quickly, existence in 30 + states, high degree of portability, lower demand on the board's staff and Washington educators, well established system of testing centers, may or may not be a strength when you use an existing system that is resident in other states you can compare Washington educators to other states and the national level.
- Said they would allow Washington educators on their national review committee.
- Must charge the fixed cost as what they charge across the country.
- Works with many states.
- PRAXIS II tests were shown to align with the Washington State endorsement competencies.
- Can be taken anywhere ETS has a testing site.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. McCallum thanked the board for the selection of NES as fitting the RFP. Should NES known that there was other criteria they would have responded accordingly. The board has talked about the flexibility and responsiveness of NES. He feels they have fulfilled the requirement of no-fault testing. NES feels that some tests could have a value added approach. If the board is willing to level the playing field NES is prepared to come to the board with the 33 tests or maybe more. NES came to the board with a little more value added. . We recognized that cost was an issue. We came up with a fee that is reasonable and fair.

50% of the teacher candidates take the test nationally.

Chair Charouhas called for the board to vote on the content knowledge test vendor. With eight votes for ETS, five votes for NES, one abstention and the chair not voting, the Board selected ETS as the vendor of the content knowledge test.

IMPACT OF REFORM ON A SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Dr. Dennis Sterner provided a presentation on the impact of reform on a school of education a case study from Whitworth College. Dr. Sterner's presentation may be downloaded from: www.pesb.wa.gov/meetings/may2002/presentations.htm

The board heard a short presentation from a student enrolled in the Whitworth teacher preparation program.

ROUTE 4 SUBCOMMITTEE

On April 24, 2002, ESD 112 had a reception for all 20 candidates that will be going through the alternative routes program. This reception gave Ken a chance to see the faces of the people who are going through the program. The candidates are really excited and there was a lot of competition.

The Route 4 subcommittee agreed to have a report ready at the September meeting. The report will be an information report and we will look to take action at the November meeting. The subcommittee will meet in June, July and in August. The subcommittee will look at geographic equity and make sure that rural districts are able to recruit as well as regional certification as Dr. Lin Douglas from OSPI has discussed. We are anticipating the release of the OSPI Supply and Demand report in mid-June.

PRINCIPAL SUB COMMITTEE MEETING

Dr. Elaine Aoki gave a brief report on the principal subcommittee meeting. As future topics the committee will explore the role of the principal. Will work with AWSP to make sure we are running on parallel tracks in regards to the ISLLC standards. We will explore which roles will impact that job. Once we start down the track of exploring role changes of a principal, we will look at how it changes faculty and staff of the school. We will also connect with what other states have explored with regards to role changes.

Principals will still need to establish that they are still in charge, however they will need to discuss how to delegate. This will be a topic for a discussion paper. The committee will discuss how to tie into different constituency groups.

OTHER BUSINESS

Tom announced he will retire from the Board in July.

Norm Wisner has been selected as the facilitator for the retreat.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 3pm.